

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 04:30:15 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #258
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 26 Jul 93 Volume 93 : Issue 258

Today's Topics:

 Call sign snobbery
 Code/NoCode

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 16:28:26 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Call sign snobbery
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

drt@athena.mit.edu (David R Tucker) writes:

> In article <1993Jul22.083830.174873@locus.com> dana@lando.la.locus.com (Dana
> H. Myers) writes:

>

> --

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
> * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer *
> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *
>

> KK6JQ = 9+3+9+3+11+3+13+3+13+7 = 74 units long! No wonder you
> want to liberalize code requirements! :->

Hmmm... so lets see....

KD1NR = 9+3+7+3+17+3+5+3+7 = 57 units... not too bad.

Tony

```

      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
      \      / system @ garlic.sbs.com                      Soon W5YI VE
      \__/_/
      (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
  /|  _ _ _ \
 / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || { _ _ } ||
  || _ _ _ _ || (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^

```

Date: Fri, 23 Jul 1993 16:19:38 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Code/NoCode
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

> Theres been tons of stuff going around abt the NoCode/Code licenses. KD1HZ is
> right, the FCC gave in to pressure from Big Radio Comapnies and created the
> license class. I think it attracts alot of the CB croud who just memorize
> answers and spill them out on the mult-choice sheet. But not all nocoders are
> like that. Im sure the license class also brings in a lot of excellent
> operators, some even take the code later. I just don't want VHF/UHF to turn
> into CB. Again, alot of CB people who move UP to ham radio also turn out to
> be excellent operators (I know some). Maybe the FCC should allow a nocode
> license for one year, after that the code must be taken...I don't know, just
> a thought...

I do agree that the no-code licenses should be limited to 1-2 years without
renewal. That would certainly encourage incentive licensing.

> No offense to nocodes who are good operators...
>
> If u have a UNIX machine, direct all flames to /dev/null!
> If not, direct all flames to /dev/null@orca.ele.uri.edu
>
> Again this is NOT a no code flame, just an opinion...

Uh oh Swami, even though you specified /dev/null for any flames you're
probably gonna get them anyhow.

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
          \__/_/
            (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
      /|  ___ \_/
    /  | {MTV}||   MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
*  || {___}||
    ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
    ^^      ^^
-----
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #258
